

THE MULTIFUNCTIONALITY OF SOURCE CITATIONS AND INDIRECT SPEECH IN ARRIAN'S *ANABASIS OF ALEXANDER**

Abstract: Scholars tend to regard the citations of the *Anabasis of Alexander* as an expression of Arrian's uncertainty or of the fact that he was drawing his information from sources other than Ptolemy and Aristobulus, while no efforts have been made to explore the functions of source citations and indirect speech in the work which move beyond the criteria of uncertainty and detachment. In this paper, I argue that Arrian took advantage of the traditional multifunctional potential of source citations and indirect speech in his *Anabasis of Alexander*, and in this way I reconsider the issue of how Arrian used his sources. My main argument is that in the *Anabasis* source citations, mostly the impersonal but occasionally the named ones too, are frequently aimed at emphasising the following four aspects: (a) a shift in the author's interest towards biographical details about Alexander (his characterisation and a focus on his interpersonal relationships); (b) the author's intention to digress from his linear historical narrative; (c) pivotal points of the enterprise; and (d) introducing or transitioning to a new event of the campaign.

Keywords: Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, source citations, indirect speech, narrative analysis

Scholarly interest in Arrian's use of source citations and indirect speech in the *Anabasis of Alexander* has been shaped to a significant degree by his introductory notes in the First Preface of the work (*Praef.* 1–3). Arrian informs us that he based his account principally on the histories of Ptolemy I Soter and Aristobulus of Cassandreia because he considered them the most reliable in comparison to other authors (*Praef.* 1–2). Arrian thus offers to the reader two kinds of testimonies which are to be found in his work: the most reliable ones, drawn from Ptolemy and Aristobulus, and less trustworthy stories, which are perhaps merely rumours (*ὡς λεγόμενα*), but which he nonetheless included in his account because he considered them worth narrating and not entirely false (*Praef.* 3). This methodological principle can be easily traced throughout the *Anabasis*, especially in passages on debated events, in which Arrian offers more than one alternative version, distinguishing Ptolemy's and/or Aristobulus' testimonies as the most preferable over less

* I am indebted to the anonymous referees of *Histos* for helping me enhance the arguments of this paper by providing me with their useful comments. For the texts of Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander* and *Indike* I use A. G. Roos' (1967–8) edition and follow P. A. Brunt's (1976–83) translation.

valid ones, which are usually introduced with a λέγουσι(ν)/λέγεται phrase. As a result, by taking as their point of departure Arrian's prefatory remarks and such passages, scholars tend to regard the citations of the work as an expression of Arrian's uncertainty or of the fact that he was drawing his information from sources other than Ptolemy and Aristobulus.¹

Source citations in general, not only in Arrian but also in Greek and Roman past narratives—be they impersonal expressions and verbs such as λέγεται/*fertur* or references to specific authors—have traditionally been taken as a sign of authors' efforts to distance themselves from what they narrate. Classical prose writers very often expressed their detachment in this way, sometimes because they wished to be absolved of the responsibility for certain opinions they exposed, and on other occasions in order to express their doubts about the veracity of some information. In other cases such expressions, and the indirect speech which regularly accompanies them, overtly convey the author's reservations about the motives of his informants or underline the debate on a situation with regard to 'wie es eigentlich gewesen ist'.² Such use of source citations is especially apparent and more frequent when ancient writers narrate incredible or unlikely episodes, such as those on supernatural events, dreams and their interpretations, and other similar stories.³

However, considering only the authors' uncertainty and detachment in source citations, fruitful as it is in many cases, cannot offer a sufficient classification of this practice in general, a fact which is also admitted by scholars who adopt this approach.⁴ In recent decades modern scholarship has made significant progress in apprehending the further functions of source citations and, relatedly, indirect speech in classical historiography and biography. We thus believe today that ancient authors employed impersonal and specific source citations as literary devices too, in order to share with their readers their special interests, their interpretations of events and their evaluations of historical

¹ For this line of thought see, above all, Hammond (1993). Cf. Bosworth (1980) 20–1; Stadter (1980) 66–74; Most recently, see the fine analyses of Schunk (2019) 52–92 and Leon (2021) 33–57.

² See Cooper's (1974) especially 23–31 seminal article on the intrusive infinitives in Herodotus (cf. Cooper (1971) 65–83 and Fehling's (1971) 87–174 similar approach of source citations in Herodotus); on Thucydides' λέγεται phrases, see Westlake (1977) 346, 349–56; Westlake (1977) 346 on Xenophon. For this approach in Plutarch, see Cook (2001) 329 n. 1 with exhaustive bibliography. Equally useful are the general studies on this scheme in classical historiography of Laird (1999) 116–52 and Sulimani (2008), who focuses mainly on Diodorus of Sicily, comparing him with several other historians from Herodotus to Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus as well as Latin authors.

³ Cooper (1974) 28–9; Westlake (1977) 349–50, 354.

⁴ Westlake (1977) 346.

agents. Herodotus, Xenophon, and especially Thucydides use the phrase ‘it is said’ (λέγεται) in ‘Beinahe’ episodes in order to draw our attention to the fragility of human anticipation in the face of chance and coincidence.⁵ Studies in Thucydides, Diodorus, and Plutarch have demonstrated that all these authors typically cite their sources when they wish to exculpate or criticise individuals.⁶ Xenophon frustrates modern historians and is admitted to have often treated source citations as nothing more than a ‘stylistic quirk’.⁷ Tacitus uses historic infinitives in order to highlight the belligerents’ surprise and confusion, while Pliny employs the same scheme in his letters to Tacitus merely as an intertextual allusion to Tacitus’ *modus narrandi*.⁸ Source citations and indirect speech also emphasise human disaster and pain in episodes of great *pathos* or confirm material in accounts that were thematically attractive to ancient readers.⁹ The abundance of the samples collected and categorised in modern studies and the vast range of the ancient authors involved allows us to be confident that the emphatic dimension of source citations was a commonplace in classical prose.

In Arrian’s case, no efforts have been made to explore the functions of source citations and indirect speech in the *Anabasis* which move beyond the criteria of uncertainty and detachment.¹⁰ In one of the most recent studies on Arrian’s *Anabasis*, Daniel W. Leon, in accordance with the aforementioned traditional scholarly tendency, elaborates on cases in which Arrian, through his citations, questions his predecessors and tries, according to Leon, to convey the *sincere* message to the reader that with his work he aspires to remedy the mistakes of previous authors and restore the truth about Alexander.¹¹

⁵ Gray (2011) 77–82.

⁶ On Thucydides, see Westlake (1977) 353–4. On Diodorus, see Sulimani (2008). On Plutarch, see Cook (2001).

⁷ Tuplin (1993) 36–41 n. 91.

⁸ Augoustakis (2004–5) 267–71.

⁹ Gray (2011) 76.

¹⁰ However, most scholars justifiably object that we should not take so seriously Arrian’s programmatic distinction between the stories from Aristobulus and Ptolemy and the *λεγόμενα*, because Arrian often uses the anonymous *λέγουσι(ν)/λέγεται* for episodes stemming from these two authors too, especially when he wishes to express his scepticism about what he narrates. See Schwartz (1895) 124iff.; Kornemann (1935) 21–30; Brunt (1976) xxix; Bosworth (1980) 20–1; Sisti (2001) XXXII, XXXVI. This view is of great significance for understanding Arrian’s relation with his sources, in that it suggests that he used source citations in his work in a much more complicated way than he implies in his prefatory statement.

¹¹ See especially Leon’s (2021) second chapter ‘Novelty and Revision in the Works of Arrian’ (pp. 33–61 and esp. 45–57).

Although there are indeed numerous passages which speak for Leon's approach, there is also an abundance of others which not only cannot safely be seen as indicating Arrian's doubts about his sources but also, and most importantly, occasionally betray Arrian's effort to trick us into believing that he doubts even though he does not.

In this paper, I elaborate on some examples of these schemes in Arrian's work which cannot be satisfactorily explained by the criterion of doubt. In particular, I argue that Arrian took advantage of the traditional multi-functional potential of source citations and indirect speech in his *Anabasis of Alexander*, and in this way I reconsider the issue of how Arrian used his sources. My main argument is that in the *Anabasis* source citations, mostly the impersonal but occasionally the named ones too, and indirect speech are frequently aimed at emphasising the following four aspects: (a) a shift in the author's interest towards biographical details about Alexander (his characterisation and a focus on his interpersonal relationships); (b) the author's intention to digress from his linear historical narrative; (c) pivotal points of the enterprise; and (d) introducing or transitioning to a new event of the campaign.

I. Citations and Indirect Speech as Markers of Biographical Orientation

Arrian very often uses source citations and indirect speech as a message to his readers that he will focus more on Alexander as an individual and less on the general historical framework within which the events of a story unfolded. He employs this technique in episodes where he penetrates the minutiae pertaining to Alexander's interaction with other individuals. He includes such stories in his account either by interrupting with one of them the narration which focuses on the overall historical context,¹² or by gathering more than one such tale in a digression.¹³ However, independently of whether we are faced with a single episode or a group of stories, Arrian always records them in indirect speech and by citing either anonymous or identified sources. The use of indirect speech in 100% of the anecdotes of biographical orientation could be attributed exclusively to Arrian's reservations about the validity of these stories. This is a reasonable assumption, especially since Arrian does often express his scepticism about the content of these anecdotes or stresses to us the fact that there is a disagreement among sources about either the whole story or individual details of it (see below). However, although in eight out of

¹² 1.9.10; 2.4.7–11; 3.3.3–5; 6.1.1–6, 13.4–5, 26.1–3; 7.4.5, 22.1–5, 24.1–3.

¹³ 2.12.3–8; 3.12.3–8; 4.8–14; 4.19.5–20.3; 7.1.4–2.4, 14.2–10, 18.1–6.

the seventeen cases (almost 47%) Arrian does indeed proceed with an overt expression of doubt or explains that there has been a controversy in the sources,¹⁴ many other cases offer strong evidence that Arrian had no reason to doubt the reliability of a story and, what is more, that he intended instead to present it as reliable proof of his views on certain facets of Alexander's character.

This practice is particularly manifest when the information offered in indirect speech belongs to a wider unit, standing next to information which is more closely connected with the historical context of the plot. At the end of the narrative on the destruction of Thebes, for example, Arrian records the decisions that determined the city's doom and the *status quo* in Boeotia (1.9.9–10). Although the information that concerns the general historical context (the installation of a garrison in the Cadmean territory, the devastation of the land and its distribution to the allies, the enslavement of the population, and the reestablishment of Orchomenus and Plataea) is offered in direct speech (1.9.9), Alexander's order to his soldiers not to tear down Pindar's house and to spare the poet's descendants is recorded in indirect speech introduced by λέγουσιν ὅτι (1.9.10).

In this case, indirect speech does not necessarily mean that Arrian doubts the veracity of the story about Pindar's house¹⁵ or that he drew it from his secondary sources, as is occasionally argued.¹⁶ Although it is rightly admitted that the story may stem from Ptolemy or Aristobulus as well,¹⁷ little effort has been made to explain the use of indirect speech. If Arrian did not indicate a

¹⁴ See the suspenseful anecdote on Alexander's treatment by Philip of Acarnania in Tarsus (2.4.7–11). This example is also discussed in the main part of this section. In 2.12.3–8 Arrian records the anecdotes about Alexander's kindness in explaining to Darius' family that Darius is alive, and about Darius' mother's mistaking Hephaestion for Alexander. The historian completes his narration with the comment that, although he cannot guarantee the validity of these stories, he has chosen to include them because they show that Alexander inspired authors to write about his famed generosity and respect for friendship. Cf. Arrian's doubts about what kind of animal helped the Macedonians find their way in the desert to the oasis of Siwah (3.3.3). Arrian's reservations about the reliability of stories about Clitus' death and Callisthenes' opposition to Alexander (4.8–14) are discussed in the last section. See also the anecdote about Alexander's refusing to drink the water he was offered in the Gedrosian desert, an incident about which Arrian states that he is not certain whether it took place in the Hindu Kush or in this desert (6.26.1–3). Lastly, see 7.14.2–10 on the exaggerations about Alexander's mourning of Hephaestion's death and 7.22.1–5 and 7.24.1–3 for the disagreement of the sources about certain details of stories on omens about Alexander's death.

¹⁵ Niese (1893) 57 n. 5.

¹⁶ Instinsky (1961) 248 n. 1; Slater (1971) 146; Tóth (2007) 404.

¹⁷ Brunt (1983) 550; Bosworth (1980) 91.

change in his sources and did not question the material about Pindar, why then did he use indirect speech? The answer may lie in the fact that indirect speech, as in many other cases examined below, marks a shift of interest towards Alexander's virtues. Alexander is not only portrayed as a person of special *aidōs*, but also, by paying tribute to a poet, appears as the protector of culture. Given that Pindar symbolised the Panhellenic athletic spirit and the national unity of the Greeks, Alexander's anti-Hellenic cruelty against the Thebans is counterbalanced by his respect for the Olympic, Isthmian, and Nemean games.¹⁸ The detail in indirect speech is introduced by a *καί*, which indicates that it is something supplementary to the main narrative. However, the parenthetical nature of the information does not necessarily reflect the author's doubts about its veracity; it rather shows to the reader that the author's interest moves from the general historical context towards Alexander as an individual.

Another passage where a source citation marks that the general historical context of an event is overshadowed by Arrian's interest in Alexander as an individual is the account of the king's marriage with Rhoxane. Here, the Macedonians have conquered the Sogdian rock and Alexander falls in love with the young princess. While the rest of the narrative unfolds in direct speech, Alexander's falling in love with Rhoxane is offered in indirect speech (4.19.5: *λέγουσιν*). According to Arrian, Alexander fell in love with her but did not want to take advantage of the fact that she was his captive. He decided instead to respect her by marrying her. It is hard to believe that Arrian doubted this story, as he explicitly praises Alexander for his moderate decision (4.19.6).

Alexander's wedding with a barbarian woman is closely connected with the historical framework of this phase of the campaign. First, this marriage is today commonly believed to have been dictated by Alexander's policy of establishing a cultural coexistence of the West and the East. Second, it was severely criticised by the Macedonians.¹⁹ However, Arrian avoids approaching the matter from this point of view, as Alexander's moderation is obviously cut off from any historical background. It has been argued that Arrian takes a stance on Alexander's moderation concerning his wedding with Rhoxane in order to give an implicit answer to the criticism Alexander received both by his contemporaries as well as by later authors.²⁰ Even so, Arrian answers the criticisms aimed at Alexander by touching not upon the historical significance of the matter (as he does in the epilogue, 7.29.3–4) but upon Alexander's

¹⁸ Instinsky (1961) 248–50; Bosworth (1980) 91; Sisti (2001) 333; Tóth (2007) 406.

¹⁹ Bosworth (1995) 131–2.

²⁰ Bosworth (1995) 131–2.

personal affairs with women (cf. also the ensuing anecdotes in 4.20.1–3 about Alexander's moderation towards Darius' wife).

The next example is found in the opening paragraphs of Book 6 on Alexander's false identification of the Indus and the Nile (6.1.1–6). Arrian opens his account with direct speech: Alexander, having his army prepared for the voyage on the Hydaspes, intended to sail by the rivers down to the Indian Sea. He also had the incorrect impression that he had discovered the sources of the Nile. Having observed crocodiles in the Indus, as there were in no other river except the Nile (cf. Arr. *Ind.* 6.8 = *FGrHist* 134 F 7), and beans on the banks of the Acesines similar to those found in Egypt, and having learned that the Acesines joins the Indus, he believed that the Nile was a continuation of the Indian rivers and that its sources were in India (6.1.1–3). At this point, Arrian changes his narrative mode into indirect speech. By means of intrusive infinitives (i.e., infinitives with no governing verb) and accusatives, he adds (καὶ δὴ καί) some further information: Alexander wrote (γράφαι) to his mother letters about India saying to her that he thought he found the springs of the Nile. Arrian retains indirect speech in the following lines too, where we learn that eventually Alexander was informed (μαθεῖν) by the natives that the Indus flows out into the Indian Ocean and is not connected to the Egyptian river. The king then omitted (ἀφελεῖν) the part of the letter to his mother concerning the Nile and he ordered (κελεῦσαι) his men to prepare the fleet (6.1.4–6). After this, Arrian returns to direct speech, informing us of the origins of the crews in Alexander's boats (6.1.6).

The intrusive infinitives of this passage have been considered an indicator of Arrian's doubts about the validity of the material he records²¹ and his intention to show that he changes sources.²² However, thanks to Strabo, we are in a position to believe confidently that Arrian's sources with regard to this material were, among others, Nearchus (Str. 15.1.25 = *FGrHist* 133 F 20) and Aristobulus (Str. 15.1.45 = *FGrHist* 139 F 38).²³ We need not assume that Arrian doubted a story that stemmed not from one but from two authors he trusted the most, given that Arrian himself explains to us in the First Preface that the agreement of two reliable sources about a story is for him a sufficient attestation to its validity (*Praef.* 1). Now, as for the first part of the account which is

²¹ Hammond (1993) 263.

²² See Brunt's (1983) 101 translation of the beginning of ch. 6.1.4 'it is reported that', which reflects Brunt's explanation of the intrusive infinitives as an indicator of a change of sources. Cf. Hammond (1993) 263 n. 3.

²³ Schwartz (1895) 1239; *FGrHist* 133 with Jacoby's commentary ad loc.; Strasburger (1934) 44; Pearson (1960) 123; Brunt (1983) 101 n. 2; Pédech (1984) 184 n. 2; Bosworth (1993) 414 nn. 32–3; Bosworth (1995) 347 and 361 n. 1; Sisti and Zambrini (2004) 518–19.

related in indirect speech, Alexander's letter to Olympias, this must have been a part of Nearchus' and Aristobulus' accounts too and Arrian took it as a valid, integral part of the whole story.²⁴ Indirect speech should better be explained again as Arrian's means to show to the reader that he is penetrating here in more depth into Alexander's personal life, and specifically his correspondence with his mother. The parenthetical nature of the information on the letter to Olympias (*καὶ δὴ καί*; cf. the story of Pindar's house above) is again to be seen as emphatic and not as a sign of the author's uncertainty.

Particularly illuminating is the reported speech about the reactions of Alexander's friends to his severe injury during the siege of the Malli (6.13.4–5), especially if we compare it with the immediately preceding direct speech about the reaction of the entire army (6.12.1–13.3). Here, Alexander's prolonged recovery generated rumours that he was already dead and that the heads of the army were hesitant to reveal this to the soldiers in order to avoid panic. Alexander, being informed of his men's uneasiness and out of fear of a potential reaction, appeared in front of his soldiers in order to set them at ease. This episode, especially the last scene, in which the soldiers scream out of joy for their beloved king, undoubtedly underscores Alexander's popularity.²⁵ Arrian, however, is also interested in the whole expedition too, as he also offers a rational explanation for the soldiers' relief: the men were afraid that, in case Alexander was dead, they would be leaderless in their *nostos* through the inhospitable Indian territory (6.12.1–2). Furthermore, Arrian brings to the foreground the danger of the potential disruption of the Macedonian troops (6.13.1). All these subjects, of course, transcend the limits of encomiastic biography, which is why the events are narrated in direct speech.

By contrast, in the next two paragraphs (6.13.4–5), when Arrian zooms in on the reactions of individuals closer to Alexander, he adopts discourse in indirect speech. According to Nearchus (*FGrHist* 133 F 2), Alexander's friends scolded him for risking his life by fighting as a mere soldier on the front line. A Boeotian consoled the king and thereby became one of his best friends. The reference to Nearchus should not be seen as an indicator of Arrian's doubts about the episode. Arrian believed Nearchus' story, as he explicitly states immediately after mentioning him (6.13.4: *καὶ μοι δοκεῖ ἄχθεσθαι Ἀλέξανδρος τοῖσδε τοῖς λόγοις*). He comments that Alexander, although knowing that his friends were right, could not resist his passion for military glory. He cites Nearchus not necessarily because he wants to stress that he drew upon the Cretan and not upon Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, as has been argued²⁶

²⁴ Hammond (1993) 263.

²⁵ Stadter (1980) 113.

²⁶ Hammond (1993) 269.

(besides, there must have been no change of sources, as Nearchus must have been the source for the previous account on the troops' reaction too),²⁷ but in order to isolate an incident of more intense biographical significance from the rest of the account in order to stress well-known characteristics of Alexander, such as his relationship with his friends and his immoderate pursuit of posthumous fame.²⁸ Both in the narrative of the Macedonian troops' fears and in the anecdote of Alexander's friends, Arrian examines Alexander's injury. Still, on each occasion the event is approached from a different angle and with different goals. Both reactions jointly satisfy Arrian's twofold purpose to offer a rational interpretation of the gravity of this injury for the whole expedition and to penetrate Alexander's character. The historical approach is offered in direct speech, while the biographical portrait in indirect.

There is a similar example in Arrian's account of the weddings held by Alexander between Macedonian officials and Asian women (7.4.4–8). When we read of Hephaestion, Arrian explains that Alexander gave him Drypetis, Darius' daughter and sister of Alexander's wife, because he wanted Hephaestion's children to be his nephews. This explanation is offered in indirect speech with no governing verb (7.4.5). Again, the focus on Alexander's mentality is expressed in indirect speech (see the intrusive infinitive *ἐθέλειν*). The presence of the infinitive is explained by the citation *ὡς δὲ λέγει Ἀριστόβουλος* (7.4.4) which Arrian uses to introduce the reader to this theme. However, the rest of the account of the weddings unfolds with indicatives (*ἦν ἡγμένη* and *δίδωσι*, which lie between the citation and the intrusive infinitive, and the *ἔδωκεν, ἐποιήθησαν, ἐτέθησαν, ἦκον, παρεκαθέζοντο, ἐδεξιώσαντο, ἐφίλησαν, ἦρξεν, ἐγίγνοντο, ἔδοξε, ἀπῆγον, ἐπέδωκεν, ἡγμένοι ἦσαν, ἐκέλευσε, ἐγένοντο, ἐδόθησαν* after the infinitive). Again, the shift from direct speech into indirect speech coincides with the shift of interest from the general historical context, the weddings at Susa, towards a facet of Alexander's personal life, his love for Hephaestion.

At the beginning of Book 7, we find a similar example, which exemplifies in a more noticeable way the function of indirect speech as an indicator of a shifting of the interest from the general historical context towards Alexander's

²⁷ Bosworth (1996) 54 nn. 70–1, 55 n. 73. On this mode of Arrian's citing Nearchus, see Schunk (2019) 92–109.

²⁸ For the subject of glory in this episode, see Bosworth (1996) 60; Sisti and Zambrini (2004) 537, who believe that for Arrian the anonymous Boeotian exemplifies Alexander's flatterers and suggest that the man is mentioned in an equally pejorative way as other flatterers are in 2.6.4 and 7.29.1. I would rather say that the man merely symbolises the model of a 'good friend', because this romantic short story of how a friendship was born between the king and one of his men fits very well with the beginning of 6.13.4–5 on the caring friends of Alexander.

character. Arrian opens the book by recording the several opinions expressed up to his time with regard to Alexander's plans in 324/3 BC. The Macedonian's intentions in that period are today just as obscure a subject as they were in antiquity, while the diversity of the ancient opinions indicates, if anything, that Alexander's plans occupied the minds of the ancient historians as well.²⁹ A reader, and especially an ancient one, after reading a series of views, would have expected Arrian to express his own opinion on the matter. On the contrary, Arrian writes, 'For my part I cannot determine with certainty what sort of plans Alexander had in mind, and it is no purpose of mine to make guesses, but there is one thing I think I can assert myself, that none of Alexander's plans were small and petty and that, no matter what he had already conquered, he would not have stopped there quietly [...], but that he would always have searched far beyond for something unknown, in competition with himself in default of any other rival'. Immediately afterwards he composes two episodes in indirect speech on Alexander's meetings with the Indian Brahmins and Diogenes from Sinope, in which he stresses Alexander's megalomania, his self-awareness concerning his interest in everything unexplored and his greed, but also his inability to control himself.³⁰ Arrian cannot have doubted those stories, since he explicitly states that he approves of the Brahmin's disdain of Alexander (7.1.5: *καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε ἐπαινῶ τοὺς σοφιστὰς τῶν Ἰνδῶν, ὧν λέγουσιν ἔστιν οὗς ...* 'in this connection I commend the Indian sophists, some of whom, the story goes ...').

These examples show that Arrian uses indirect speech even in cases in which he does not doubt the content of a story he narrates. If this is the case, then it seems that in these passages indirect speech merely coincides with a shift of interest from the overall historical context towards the details of certain personal moments of Alexander and his characterisation, without marking the author's doubt about these stories. This conclusion is significant in that it reveals one further function of indirect speech in anecdotes of biographical orientation besides the function of indicating the author's doubt: indirect speech is used by Arrian as a literary means by which to mark to the reader exactly this shift of interest towards minutiae of Alexander's personal life. Consequently, we are offered one further prism through which to read even some passages which contain Arrian's statements of reservation and which,

²⁹ Cf. D.S. 18.4.2–6; Curt. 10.1.17–18; Wilcken (1937); Tarn (1939); Robinson (1940); Badian (1968); Brunt (1983) 500–4; Högemann (1985); Bosworth (1988) 185–211; Hammond (1993); Sisti and Zambrini (2004) 579–82.

³⁰ On ancient sources about Alexander's love for philosophy, see, principally, Koulakiotis (2006) 59–147.

due to these statements, have traditionally been seen as being narrated in indirect speech *only* because Arrian questioned them. Let us consider some of them.

In ch. 2.4.7–11, Arrian relates the anecdote about Alexander's cure by Philip the Acarnanian in Tarsus. Alexander fell ill, Aristobulus says because of weariness and others because of a cold. While doctors could find no cure for the king, Philip the Acarnanian, a physician and one of Alexander's intimates, offered to Alexander a medicine that, according to him, would cure him. In the meantime, Parmenio sent a message to Alexander advising him not to trust Philip, as rumours were circulating that he had been bribed by Darius to poison Alexander. The story ends in a crescendo of suspense, as we observe Alexander drinking the drug, while Philip is reading Parmenio's accusations.³¹ Arrian closes his narrative by commenting that Alexander wanted to show to Philip that he trusted his friends to such a degree that he was not afraid even to die in order to defend his faith in them.

Arrian opens this short and vivid episode with the discrepancy between Aristobulus' version of the origins of Alexander's illness and those of others. While Aristobulus records that Alexander fell ill due to weariness, others support the idea that he swam in the cold waters of the river Cydnus (2.4.7). Aristobulus' version is offered in direct speech accompanied by the parenthetical phrase *ὡς μὲν Ἀριστοβούλῳ λέλεκται*, while the consensus of the other sources is offered in indirect speech with the infinitive *νήξασθαι* and accusatives introduced by the verb *λέγουσι*. Thereafter, Arrian proceeds to some clarifications about this river in direct speech and then continues the main episode with infinitives and accusatives (2.4.8–11).

Indirect speech fits well with the two verbs *λέλεκται* and *λέγουσι*; it also fits well with Arrian's practice of using indirect speech for a story of biographical orientation in its entirety whenever he doubts even a small detail of it. However, the question is why Arrian does not do the same in narratives which pertain mainly to the overall historical context and not Alexander. For there are many cases in which Arrian is insecure about some part of an event (battle, siege etc.), but he still uses direct speech for the narration of such events and confines his use of indirect speech only to the individual details he questions. It seems that Arrian is more prone to use indirect speech in stories exclusively about Alexander than in stories about historical events, such as battles, sieges, marches etc. We will come back to this attitude of Arrian in the closing remarks to this section.

One should not assume that Arrian uses indirect speech as an indication that the story of Tarsus is an unreliable *λεγόμενον*. Judging from the sources

³¹ Sisti and Zambrini (2001) 404.

that we have at our disposal, we can assume that the discrepancy concerned only the origins of the disease and not the whole episode.³² Aristobulus, as well as Ptolemy, must have included this story, which is why indirect speech does not reflect Arrian's doubts about the validity of the episode. Arrian's choice to write the whole story in indirect speech can better be explained as being an instruction to the reader about the purely biographical character of the story in contrast to the historical nature of its context. Alexander's illness, according to Arrian, was of particular historical significance, as it led to the king's prolonged stay at Tarsus, the result being that Darius transferred his army to Issus. Given that, in Arrian's opinion, the choice of this particular battlefield was a very decisive factor in the Persian defeat, Alexander's illness is presented as the root of Darius' failure. However, we read of all these *a posteriori* in direct speech (2.6.4). In the main narrative of the illness, Arrian prefers to use this subject as an opportunity to focus on an incident clearly of biographical nature, an incident which stresses a *topos* in Alexander's iconography, i.e., his faith in the value of friendship.³³ Indirect speech is the means for him to instruct the reader that he is deviating from the representation of the general historical context for the sake of a story of exclusively biographical interest. In such passages, we may see *oratio obliqua* as a meta-narrative generic distinction between historical and biographical ways of writing.

We can use the same prism to explain the indirect speech in two further cases. To begin with the first of them, after narrating Alexander's wedding with Rhoxane (4.19.5) and in an effort to strengthen his conclusion of this short story, that Alexander was moderate with women, Arrian offers one further example of the king's self-control in his interaction with women. According to this story, after Alexander captured Darius' family at the battle of Issus, an intimate of Darius escaped the Macedonian camp, met Darius and assured him that his wife was being treated with respect by Alexander. Darius then, the story goes, prayed to the gods that, if he were deprived of his empire, Alexander should succeed him (4.20.1–3). Arrian's choice to narrate the story in indirect speech could be attributed to his reservations about its content. First, in Book 2 he has already explicitly expressed his scepticism over stories about Alexander and Darius' family (2.12.8). Second, this story includes a conversation between two Asians, a detail which it is difficult to believe a Greek author had access to. Arrian typically narrates exchanges between Asians or between them and Alexander in indirect speech,³⁴ a habit which reasonably mirrors his doubts about whether conversations that took place

³² Bosworth (1980) 190–2; Sisti (1982) and (2001) 401–4.

³³ Stadter (1980) 103.

³⁴ 1.12.10; 5.2.3, 19.2; 7.16.6.

away from the Macedonian circles could have reliably survived in Greek sources (see also next section). The indirect speech in this case could therefore be attributed to Arrian's doubts about stories of Alexander's interaction with Darius' family and about what was said by non-Greeks.

However, Arrian does not express any kind of disbelief about the content of this anecdote and, second, he concludes by saying that this story proves that 'even enemies are not indifferent to virtuous acts' (4.20.3). Indirect speech in a story which is used by the author as a piece of evidence for his verdict about Alexander should not be taken as indicating the author's doubts—at least not about the whole story. Indirect speech should rather be seen as a marker of focus on Alexander's personal life. The anecdote is added to the account about Alexander's wedding with Rhoxane, which, as demonstrated, is also narrated in indirect speech. In the story about Darius and his intimate, Arrian merely continues using indirect speech in order to show to us that he is still dealing with Alexander himself and not the general historical canvas.

Similarly, the indirect speech in the story about Alexander refusing to drink water in the Gedrosian desert because he wished to endure the same hardship as his men (6.26.1–3) should not be seen exclusively as a sign of doubt about the reliability of the story. Arrian opens this anecdote by stating that he cannot say whether this incident took place during the crossing of the Hindu Kush or of the Gedrosian desert (6.26.1). He then decides to narrate the entire story with intrusive infinitives. However, he does not question any other part of the story and, again, concludes by praising Alexander for this deed (6.26.3). Once again, indirect speech cannot be taken as reflecting the author's doubt about the whole story, as this assumption would overlook the fact that the author uses this tale as evidence for his protagonist's virtue.

To conclude this section, as transpires from the analysis of the aforementioned examples, Arrian, although typically using indirect speech in narratives of intense biographical focus, does not always employ this technique as a sign of doubt. Sometimes, he seems to have decided to narrate a whole story in indirect speech because some part of it was questionable, while in other cases his use of indirect speech cannot be attributed at all to reservations about the validity of what he relates. So, the question still remains, why did he choose to narrate all the stories about the minutiae of Alexander's personal life in indirect speech, even those which he seems to believe and use as part of his argumentation about Alexander's character?

One answer to this question could be that Arrian was generally sceptical about the truthfulness of such stories about Alexander's interpersonal relationships; that even those which seemed to him the most reliable were, at the end of the day, not considered by him entirely unquestionable. Most of them contain details of Alexander's life to which one could not have had access. This

is an observation which Arrian could have made, which is why, it may be assumed, he chose to narrate these tales in indirect speech even in those cases where he doubted only a small part of the story.

But again, why did he not choose the same method of exposition in narratives of historical events where he doubted certain information that he included? In many accounts of battles or of other events that pertain to the general historical canvas and not Alexander's personal life, Arrian lets us know that he was faced with disputed details, such as the numbers of the troops and the casualties in a battle,³⁵ or even the way in which a battle was conducted.³⁶ However, he never chooses to narrate a battle, a siege or the Macedonian army's march in indirect speech, even in cases where he is confused about certain details. Let us consider two striking examples. One is the narrative of Bessus' arrest. Arrian composes a two-page narrative (Teubner edition) in direct speech (3.29.6–30.5), which he states that he draws from Ptolemy (the latter is presented as being the one who was assigned the task of arresting Bessus). Only after completing his account does he explain in a couple of lines that there is also Aristobulus' version, according to which Ptolemy did not arrest Bessus, nor did he lead him to Alexander, but it was Spitamenes and Dataphernes who took Bessus to Ptolemy and led him to Alexander (3.30.5). This is a case in which Arrian was aware of the questionable nature of not only a small part of a story but of significant aspects of it. And still he decided to narrate it in direct speech and to clarify only at the end of his account that there were also other versions, and, what is more, versions which were supported by Arrian's second main source, Aristobulus.

Even more striking in this respect is the description of the battle against the Malli, during which Alexander was heavily injured in the chest. In a four-page description (Teubner edition), Arrian narrates, in direct speech, how the king reached the citadel's wall and was forced to fight his enemies alone, initially escorted only by three men, Peucestas, Leonnatus, and Abreas (6.9.1–11.2). This episode was one of the most celebrated moments in Alexander's career, as his wound in this battle nearly cost his life. Similarly to the narrative of Bessus' arrest, at the end of this account too Arrian proceeds with a digression, in which he exposes the debated details of this episode and endeavours to clarify what is true about them and what is not (6.11.2–8). In the context of this digression, Arrian reveals to us that sources do not agree even about certain information he used in his preceding account of the battle in direct speech. We read that the majority of the sources claim that the battle was not fought against the Malli but against the Oxydracae (6.11.3); that,

³⁵ See, e.g., 1.2.7; 2.8.8; 3.15.6, 23.4; 4.25.4.

³⁶ See, e.g., 4.3.5, 6.1–2; 5.19.3–5.

although Peucestas is commonly agreed to have been one of those men who fought by Alexander's side on the wall, there was a controversy about Leonnatus and Abreas (6.11.7), about whom Arrian seems in his main narrative of the battle to be confident that they escorted Alexander (6.9.3–10.1). All this shows that Arrian has no qualms about narrating historical events in direct speech even when he includes in his account questionable information.

It seems that Arrian is unwilling to use indirect speech in accounts pertaining to the general historical context even in those cases in which significant parts of a story are debated. On the other hand, in accounts focusing on Alexander's personal moments he seems willing to use indirect speech even when the slightest doubt about a small detail arises or even when he does not question what he narrates. In my view, this methodological discrepancy can better be attributed to factors which transcend the issue of Arrian's trust in his sources, factors such as the generic physiognomy Arrian wished to convey for the *Anabasis*, and the way he wished to fashion himself to his readers in order to satisfy what he believed they expected from him as a historian.

With regard to the genre Arrian wished the *Anabasis* to be a part of, it is commonly agreed that Arrian chose the so-called march narrative to be the distinctive compositional feature of his work.³⁷ The narration pertains mainly to the general historical context of Alexander's career: the route of his army through Asia, the battles he and his men fought, the administrative decisions he took and the diplomatic game between Alexander and several rulers he met on his way. Another feature of his account is its temporal linearity. Although he often proceeds with analepses and prolepses, it is unquestionable that Arrian narrates the events by mainly respecting their temporal sequences.³⁸ The moments in which Arrian decides to transfer the focal point of his interest from the main subject of his work towards Alexander's personal life interrupt this general generic physiognomy in terms of both subject matter and narrative time, given that they colour the account with more intensely biographical shades and, whenever Arrian gathers more than one, he collects stories from different periods of time, thus disrupting the linearity of his narration. Arrian chose to use indirect speech even for those biographical anecdotes he did not doubt because he must have taken them as members of this special, generically digressive category of accounts, which very often are questionable and are narrated in indirect speech. In this way, he also satisfied the expectations he believed his readership had of him in terms of the attitude he would adopt towards stories of a generally questionable nature.

³⁷ Stadter (1980); Liotsakis (2019) 81–121.

³⁸ Hidber (2007); Liotsakis (2019) 122–62.

II. Indirect Speech as Marker of Digressive Discourse

So far I have propounded the idea that Arrian occasionally uses indirect speech in order to mark a focus on stories of biographical orientation, which deviates from the predominant feature of his account, i.e., the linear representation of events that pertain to the overall historical context in which Alexander acted. If this view holds true, it is worth examining whether Arrian uses indirect speech as a marker of digressive discourse in digressions of a nature other than biographical anecdotes. In this section, first I use this way of reading indirect speech as a filter through which to look for explanations of indirect speech other than doubt in the famous digression about Alexander's arrogance and lack of self-control in 4.8–14. Second, I will maintain that Arrian also employs the same technique in digressions of geographical content.

Let us begin with the digression of 4.8–14. Apart from constituting the cornerstone of Arrian's overall narrative plan for the *Anabasis*,³⁹ the central digression of the episodes of Clitus, Callisthenes, and the conspiracy of the pages in Book 4 offers us fertile ground upon which to examine the aforementioned functionality of citations. Arrian composes this unit almost in its entirety in indirect speech, using twenty one citations (either anonymously or by giving the name of the source), a choice which has been interpreted as reflecting Arrian's effort to distance himself from facts that go against his commendatory aims. As Bosworth writes, '[n]ot surprisingly, he is sensitive about the subject-matter, which (he cannot deny) reflects adversely upon his hero (iv. 9. 1, 12. 6), and he uses language that creates a certain detachment. He reports what is said, rather than narrating fact of his own authority. Indirect speech tends to predominate ...'⁴⁰

Nevertheless, such a view overlooks Arrian's aims in composing this digression, as expressed by his own words. It cannot be that Arrian wished to extenuate Alexander's guilt in killing Clitus and promoting his own *proskynesis*, because the way that Arrian treats what he narrates in this digression and the way he links it with its context reflect nothing but his strong desire to express his personal opinion not only about Clitus and Callisthenes' effrontery but also against Alexander's vanity. In these chapters, Arrian proceeds to give eleven authorial evaluative comments on the conduct of the protagonists—including Alexander—(4.8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 9.1, 9.2, 9.6, 9.8, 9.9, 10.1, 12.6–7) and makes

³⁹ Liotsakis (2019).

⁴⁰ Bosworth (1988) 64. Prandi (1985) 171 believes that Arrian uses his comments because these subjects were the most debated in his days. For indirect speech in this digression, see also Stadter (1980) 106 and Leon (2021).

it clear from the very beginning that what we will read should be seen as further examples of Alexander's arrogance, similar to that of his cruelty towards Bessus (4.8.1; cf. 4.14.4). In such a context, indirect speech is hardly to be deemed as a reflection of Arrian's intention to maintain a neutral stance.

We can better explain Arrian's preference for indirect speech in the digression by taking into consideration his sincere doubts about the validity of some stories⁴¹ and his desire to clarify to the reader that 4.8–14 constitute a digression from the main march narrative. As for Arrian's suspicions, the murder of Clitus and Callisthenes' relationship with Alexander as well as his involvement in the conspiracy of the sages obtained a central place in historical writings from the Hellenistic period up to Arrian's age.⁴² These events could stain any idealised portrait of Alexander, which is why authors favourable towards Alexander could very easily—and actually did—change the facts and present both Clitus and Callisthenes as deserving the end they had and Alexander as being the victim of these two individuals or as being carried away by his flatterers. Arrian repeatedly questions the stories which circulated against Callisthenes (4.10.1, 10.3, 12.3, 14.1, 14.3) and occasionally shares with us his knowledge of different alternatives for a detail, such as the weapon with which Alexander killed Clitus (4.8.8), Aristobulus' putting the blame on Clitus (4.8.9), and Alexander's alleged suicide attempt after Clitus' death, a story which is contrasted by Arrian with what he regards as the more reliable version that Alexander recalled Lanice, Clitus' sister, and called himself the murderer of his friends (4.9.2–4). This must also be the case with the phrase *εἰσὶ δὲ οὐ λέγουσιν* in the opening sentence on Anaxarchus.⁴³ Arrian's comment 'if indeed he did present as received wisdom the notion ...' (4.9.8) betrays his doubts on the validity of the story.

However, in some other cases indirect speech cannot have been used as an expression of doubt. Two examples of events which are narrated as being rumours but whose reliability is not being questioned may shed some new light on the reasons why Arrian chose to compose the digression in *oratio obliqua*. The first example is the introductory statement of the digression and the initial information on Alexander's neglect of Dionysus (4.8.1–2):

⁴¹ Schwartz (1895) 1240–1.

⁴² D.S. index 17 κζ–κη; Plut. *Alex.* 48–54; Curt. 8.1.20–37 and 8.7.iff.

⁴³ Prandi (1985) 171. Brown's (1949) 240 view that the *λέγουσι* shows that Arrian does not draw here from Ptolemy is possible but not necessarily correct. If the *λέγουσι* reflects Arrian's doubts, Ptolemy should not be excluded from Arrian's sources in this case. With regard to the stories about Callisthenes, Arrian doubted even Aristobulus and Ptolemy, as he admits in 4.14.3.

Ἐνθα καὶ τὸ Κλείτου τοῦ Δρωπίδου πάθημα καὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπ' αὐτῷ
 ξυμφορὰν, εἰ καὶ ὀλίγον ὕστερον ἐπράχθη, οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ καιροῦ
 ἀφηγήσομαι. εἶναι μὲν γὰρ ἡμέραν ἱερὰν τοῦ Διονύσου Μακεδόσι καὶ
 θύειν Διονύσῳ ὅσα ἔτη ἐν αὐτῇ Ἀλέξανδρον· τὸν δὲ τοῦ Διονύσου μὲν ἐν
 τῷ τότε ἀμελῆσαι λέγουσι, Διοσκύροις δὲ θῦσαι, ἐξ' ὅτου δὴ
 ἐπιφρασθέντα τοῖν Διοσκύροις τὴν θυσίαν.

At this point it will be the moment for me to relate the tragedy of Clitus son of Dropides and the suffering it caused to Alexander, even though it actually occurred later. The story goes as follows.⁴⁴ The Macedonians kept a day sacred to Dionysus and Alexander sacrificed to him yearly on that day; only on this particular occasion he neglected Dionysus but sacrificed to the Dioscuri; some reason had made him think of sacrificing to them.

In this case, Arrian uses indirect speech neither to question the information he relates⁴⁵ nor to distance himself from the facts by presenting them as rumours stemming from another source and not as data of his own authority. The first two infinitives (εἶναι and θῦσαι) are not governed by an anonymous citation, because they precede the λέγουσι of the following sentence. If we look for a governing verb, this should be ἀφηγήσομαι, which refers to Arrian. So, the story is introduced as Arrian's own version. Moreover, even the information governed by the λέγουσι is not presented as a spurious anecdote. The λέγουσι is merely a literary *topos* that introduces a story, as that found at the beginning of the *Anabasis* (see Section 4). Arrian does not question the fact that the Macedonians had consolidated an official day of the year for the cult of Dionysus. On the contrary, he mentions this piece of information as a fact (in direct speech) at the end of the episode of Clitus in order to praise Alexander for regretting killing his friend and neglecting the sacrifice to Dionysus (4.9.5–6). We find a similar case in the λόγος κατέχει with reference to the fact that Alexander wanted his people to do him obeisance. This phrase cannot reflect Arrian's uncertainty about a fact which he repeatedly takes for granted. Arrian's use of indirect speech at the beginning of this digression should be

⁴⁴ Brunt strikingly takes the infinitives not to be governed by the ἀφηγήσομαι and adds instead the phrase 'the story goes'. This is also how he signals indirect speech in 5.28.1 and 5.28.4 (see below, p. 26), which is revealing of his view that indirect speech, even ungoverned intrusive infinitives, typically indicates Arrian's wish to refer to a source.

⁴⁵ As Brunt (1976) 534–5 and Stadter (1980) 106 imply.

seen as merely an effort to mark narrative points where he deviates from the strictly annalistic character of his march narrative.

Let us now examine two further passages which prove that Arrian used citations and indirect speech in geographical digressions too. We find an instance of this style in the second largest digression of the work, the *excursus* on the geography of India at the opening chapters of Book 5. This unit begins as follows (5.5.1–3):

Ἄλλα ὑπὲρ Ἰνδῶν ἰδίᾳ μοι γεγράφεται ... νῦν δὲ ὅσον ἐς τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα ἀποχρῶν ἐφαίνετο, τοσόνδε μοι ἀναγεγράφθω τὸν Ταῦρον τὸ ὄρος ἀπείργειν τὴν Ἀσίαν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἀπὸ Μυκάλῃς τοῦ καταντικρὺ Σάμου τῆς νήσου ὄρους, ἀποτεμνόμενον δὲ τὴν τε Παμφύλων καὶ Κιλικῶν γῆν ἔνθεν μὲν ὡς ἐς Ἀρμενίαν παρήκειν, ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀρμενίων ὡς ἐπὶ Μηδίαν παρὰ Παρθυ<a>ίους τε καὶ Χορασμίους, κατὰ δὲ Βακτρίους ξυμβάλλειν τῷ Παραπαμισῶ ὄρει, ὃ δὴ ἐκάλουν οἱ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ξυστρατεύσαντες Μακεδόνες, ὡς μὲν λέγεται τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου αὖξοντες, ὅτι δὴ καὶ ἐπέκεινα ἄρα τοῦ Καυκάσου κρατῶν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἦλθεν Ἀλέξανδρος.

However, I shall write a special monograph about India.... But the present record must be restricted to what appears sufficient to explain Alexander's achievements. Mount Taurus is the boundary of Asia, beginning from Mycale, the mountain opposite the island of Samos, then cutting through between the land of Pamphylia and Lycia it reaches Armenia, and from Armenia runs to Media past the Parthyaean and Chorasmian country, and in Bactria joins Mount Parapamisus, which the Macedonians who served with Alexander called Caucasus, with a view (so it is said) of glorifying Alexander, to make out that Alexander actually reached the farther side of Mount Caucasus, victorious in arms.

This marks the beginning of a long-scale digression on the geography of India, the largest part of which is composed in indirect speech with citations of specific authors (Eratosthenes, Megasthenes, Herodotus, Homer). However, at this point, indirect speech (*ἀπείργειν*, *παρήκειν*, *ξυμβάλλειν*) does not emerge as something recorded by a source but by Arrian himself. Once again, if we have to relate these infinitives, we should do so with the introductory *ἀναγεγράφθω* whose agent is Arrian. In his *Indike*, Arrian offers the same information in direct speech. The contrast between the two cases is explained by the aims of the author in the two works. In the *Indike* the geographical information is not a digression from but the introduction to the account. In the *Anabasis*, on the other hand, the same data contribute to the deviation from

the main subject under examination, Alexander's march, which is why Arrian, in using indirect speech, wishes to mark to the reader the parenthetical nature of the unit. Although Arrian's parsimony in using digressions was admired by ancient readers such as Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 92: 72^b41–73^a3), we should also recognise his effort to distinguish these digressions from the main narrative route on a stylistic level as well, through indirect speech.

Another example where a citation does not necessarily reflect doubts is found in the digression of 3.28.5. Here, the narrative has reached the point where Alexander and his army are crossing the Hindu Kush. Arrian digresses from the main course of his account in order to instruct the reader about the mountain range. While he cites Aristobulus with regard to the size and the vegetation of the Hindu Kush, he also elaborates on its geographical location and its relationship with other mountains of Asia, this time using the verb *λέγουσι*. It should be noted that Arrian is well aware of the fact that the Macedonians had fabricated sundry false exaggerations about this sierra in their efforts to magnify Alexander's exploit of crossing it.⁴⁶ However, on this occasion he does not use the *λέγουσιν* to question the information he offers. The sentence is as follows: 'For Caucasus is a long mountain range, so that *they say that* even Mount Taurus, which is the boundary of Cilicia and Pamphylia, is really a part of Mount Caucasus as well as other great mountains which have been distinguished from Mount Caucasus by various nomenclatures according to their geographical positions'. Elsewhere, Arrian takes this information for granted and offers it in indicatives (*Ind.* 2.2). Therefore, the *λέγουσι* neither reflects doubts nor should it lead us to exclude the possibility that Aristobulus was among those sources that relate the Hindu Kush with Taurus and other mountains.⁴⁷

Although Arrian, as demonstrated so far, uses indirect speech in every single account of biographical orientation, there are many other digressions, not only of geographical but of various content as well, which are offered in direct speech.⁴⁸ However, the majority of geographical *excursuses* in the *Anabasis* are rich in indirect speech and citations, either of anonymous or identified authors.⁴⁹ Arrian must have wanted to reassure us in this way that the geographical descriptions he offers, especially of those places he never visited himself, are the result of a careful reading of the most valid sources and are thus as reliable as possible. As a result, geographical digressions, similarly to the biographical anecdotes, constitute texts in which citations and indirect

⁴⁶ Liotsakis (2019) 112–18.

⁴⁷ But see Bosworth (1980) 370.

⁴⁸ 1.19.1–8; 2.5.2; 3.4.1–3, 22.2–6; 7.7.3–5.

⁴⁹ 3.28.5–7, 30.6–9; 5.5.1–3, 20.8–9; 7.16.3, 21.1–5.

speech typically coincide with and therefore mark moments in which Arrian deviates from the main subject matter of his account, i.e., the march of the Macedonians and their military feats. It is for this reason, I believe, that Arrian in the two aforementioned cases felt comfortable to offer geographical information in *oratio obliqua*, although in other instances he records the very same data in direct speech (cf. the indirect speech in the geographical description of 5.20.8–9 in light of the direct speech used for the same subject in 5.21.6). In these cases, indirect speech does not mark the author's doubt about what he relates. The latter merely finds it appropriate to use citations and indirect speech in a textual environment where, in his mind, these schemes are commonly employed.

III. Emphasis on Pivotal Moments of the Expedition

Citations are also used to mark pivotal points of the expedition. To begin with, in the chapters of Alexander's route to Troy (1.11.1–12.1), we find eight anonymous citations in the account of Alexander's visits and sacrifices at Homeric sites. It has been argued that these citations indicate that Arrian draws from other sources than Ptolemy and Aristobulus or/and that he questions the validity of the information he offers.⁵⁰ However, this may not be the case. First, Alexander's visit to Troy was a popular moment in the king's career, which was also emulated by many Roman leaders, including Hadrian, to whom Arrian had a close relation. In Arrian's age, Alexander's visit to Troy was taken for granted.⁵¹

Besides, there are two certain events narrated in indirect speech, which Arrian could hardly have questioned. Eduard Schwartz noted long ago that the information in indirect speech that Alexander took consecrated armour from Troy and carried it with him in battles (1.11.7–8) is elsewhere offered in direct speech. In the scene of Alexander's injury in the battle against the Malli, Arrian takes it for granted that Peucestas protected the wounded king from his enemies using the holy shield from Troy (6.10.2)⁵² Second, we can add, nor did Arrian have any reason to doubt the information in indirect speech that Alexander sacrificed a bull and made a drink offering to Poseidon and the Nereids in the Hellespont's waters (1.11.6). These rituals were Alexander's typical practice at the beginning or the end of an enterprise in rivers and seas,

⁵⁰ Stadter (1980) 74.

⁵¹ Minchin (2012).

⁵² Cf. Schwartz (1895) 1241, who, on the basis of this observation, suggests that the information introduced by the λέγουσι in ch. 1.11.8 is not to be attributed to the vulgate tradition but to Ptolemy.

a fact Arrian was familiar with, as is testified by similar scenes found in his account, all of which are offered in direct speech (cf. 6.3.1–2, 19.5).

These two cases must also be taken as examples of Arrian's use of citations in the remainder of the passage of Alexander's route to Troy. In these cases, indirect speech can hardly be satisfactorily explained by the 'doubt/change of sources' criterion and should better be examined in the light of Arrian's literary goals. These chapters prepare the reader for Arrian's appearance as the new Homer. The constant alternation between the primary narrator (Arrian) and secondary narrators (rumours) is aimed at dividing the field of action and the events taking place in it into two levels, ordinary places and those connected with the Trojan War. The events that do not refer to the epic world are recorded by the primary narrator in direct speech, while those which take place in epic sites (the Achaean port, Troy, the tombs of Priam, Achilles, and Patroclus) or which relate to the *Iliad* are presented as rumours in indirect speech.

In three cases, the contrast between the ordinary places and those related to the Trojan War is more sharply portrayed, betraying Arrian's focus on this scheme. The first antithesis concerns the sacrifices and games Alexander celebrated in Macedonia. While the games of the Olympian Zeus are given in direct speech, those in honour of the Muses are introduced with the phrase *οἱ δὲ καὶ ... λέγουσιν* (1.11.1). Immediately there follows the sign of the sweating of Orpheus' statue (1.11.2). In narrating the anecdote of the games in honour of the Muses, Arrian presents Orpheus' sweating as the Muses' response to Alexander's celebration. There is a cause-effect relationship here: Alexander tries to earn the favour of the Muses and they answer him affirmatively by making their son's statue sweat. Arrian is preparing the reader for his own appearance as the new Homer, the beloved of the Muses who will fulfil their will by glorifying Alexander through his work.⁵³

In the second case, two fields of action (Homeric and non-Homeric) coexist. Alexander is in Elaeus and Parmenio in Sestus with the Macedonian army. In what follows, Arrian narrates the routes of both men by connecting them with a *μὲν ... δέ* construction. While Parmenio's route to Abydus is offered in direct speech (1.11.6: *Παρμενίων μὲν δὴ ... διαβιβάσαι ἐτάχθη ... καὶ διέβησαν*), Alexander's journey to the Achaean port and his libations in the midst of the Hellespont to Poseidon and the Nereids is offered in indirect (1.11.6: *Ἀλέξανδρον δέ ... ὁ πλείων λόγος κατέχει*). In the third case, we have two crownings. In Troy, Alexander was crowned by his pilot Menoitius and some others, while, *others add* (*οἱ δε [λέγουσιν], ὅτι ...*), he crowned Achilles' tomb and Hephaestion Patroclus' (1.12.1).

⁵³ See Liotsakis (2019) 172–85; Schunk (2019) 16–18.

In each of these examples, we have a pair of similar actions: in the first pair, we have two celebrations of games in honour of a god; second, there are two routes; and third, we have two crownings. Each time, the part of the pair that refers to the Trojan War is distinguished through the use of indirect speech. The interchange of the primary and the secondary narrators distinguishes and thereby highlights the Homeric world. There is a spatial division between common and epic sites, and there is also a temporal dipole consisting of the narrative present and the glorious Homeric past. From 1.11 onwards, Alexander is entering the realm of epic glory. It is exactly this alternation of direct and indirect speech that conveys the coexistence of these two fields of action.

In 3.5.7 we find an anonymous citation that can hardly be seen as an indication of Arrian's scepticism. After providing the reader with a detailed catalogue of the officers appointed by Alexander to govern Egypt (3.5.1–6), Arrian explains that the king chose to distribute the administration of Egypt to so many officers because he did not find it safe to entrust it only to one man. Arrian offers this explanation in indirect speech (*λέγεται* + infinitives), but it is hard to maintain that he uses this verb here in order to question this view or to distinguish a source from Ptolemy and Aristobulus. This is because he agrees with the explanation he cites, as is obvious from his effort to compare Alexander's policy in Egypt with that of the Romans (3.5.7). Arrian probably changed his style from direct into indirect speech merely in order to draw the readers' attention to Alexander's policy in a distinguished moment of his career, the occupation of Egypt.

In 3.10.1–4, Arrian relates the dialogue between Parmenio and Alexander before the battle of Gaugamela. After Alexander's exhortation to his officers (3.9.5–8), Parmenio, they say (3.10.1: *λέγουσιν*), entered Alexander's tent and suggested that the Macedonians attack at night in order to take the Persians by surprise. Alexander rejected Parmenio's idea in a boastful fashion, claiming that it would be an unworthy choice for him to steal the victory (3.10.2). Arrian excuses the king's loftiness by saying that he spoke in such a way because others were present. He furthermore approves of Alexander's insight, since, as he explains, had the Macedonians attacked at night, additional dangers would have emerged for them due to their inexperience in the area and the Persians' familiarity with it (3.10.2–4).

Arrian opens this episode with the phrase *Παρμενίων δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι* and, although only Parmenio's opinion is given in indirect speech (*ὅτι ... παρήνει*) and Alexander's words and thoughts are offered in direct speech (indicatives), the whole debate should better be seen as being introduced by *λέγουσιν*. As demonstrated in Section 1, Arrian is more prone to use indirect speech in cases in which he is invited to penetrate into the minutiae of a state of affairs. As we

saw, conversations can legitimately be included among those elements which could be taken as the details of stories of biographical orientation. Apart from the chats we find in such anecdotes, there are also those which are incorporated in the main narration of the events which pertain to the overall historical context. We find twelve passages of this kind,⁵⁴ in six out of which Arrian offers these conversations in indirect speech, introducing the conversation with phrases such as 'they say that someone said to someone else'. In four out of these six cases, we read of a conversation between either two non-Greeks (1.12.10) or between Alexander and non-Greeks (1.4.8; 5.2.3, 19.2). As argued in Section 1, Arrian must have wanted to express through indirect speech his reservations about conversations to which his sources cannot, in his mind, have had access. The other two cases in which a conversation is offered by means of an anonymous citation and indirect speech are those about Parmenio's and Alexander's debates after Issus (2.25.2) and before Gaugamela (3.10.1–4). It could be argued that, similarly to the accounts about the conversations conducted by non-Greeks, in these two cases Arrian uses indirect speech to express his reservations about the content of the discussion he records. We find three further short conversations between Parmenio and Alexander in direct speech (1.13.3–7, 18.6–9; 3.18.11–12). So, one could assume, Arrian uses direct speech for these three which he feels more certain about, and indirect speech for those he questions.

However, this is not the case. In one of these cases (before the battle of the Granicus in 1.13.3–7) in which Arrian records a discussion between Parmenio and Alexander, it is evident that Arrian, although recording this debate in direct speech, consciously has Alexander uttering in this case Hector's words at *Il.* 6.441–6 (*Anab.* 1.13.6–7). It has been demonstrated that Arrian deliberately creates a cross-reference between this Homeric allusion and the one of the Second Preface (1.12.5) of 6.429–30. Arrian can hardly have expected literate readers of the Imperial period not to notice this cross-reference or at least the Homeric style of Alexander's words.⁵⁵ In this respect,

⁵⁴ 1.4.8: Alexander's short conversation with the Celts; 1.5.3: Alexander's discussion with Langarus; 1.12.10: the words said by Arsites and Memnon at the Persian council before the battle of the Granicus; the debates between Alexander and Parmenio before the battles of the Granicus (1.13.3–7) and Gaugamela (3.10.1–4); Parmenio's admonitions to Alexander about what to do with his navy (1.18.6–9), to accept Darius' offer after the battle of Issus (2.25.2) and about the destruction of the royal palace in Persepolis (3.18.11–12); Alexander's discussions with Acuphis (5.2.3) and Porus (5.19.2) in the Indian account of Book 5; Alexander's commands to Ptolemy (5.23.7); the king's conversation with the Chaldaean priests (7.16.6).

⁵⁵ For this Homeric cross-reference between the two passages, see Liotsakis (2019) 179–84.

that Arrian does not present the story about Alexander's words as a rumour (*λεγόμενον*) definitely does not mean that he wishes to convey to his readers the impression that he takes these specific words of Alexander as a factual event. Arrian merely follows a prevalent *topos* in Greco-Roman historiography, i.e., the freedom of historians to have the characters of their narratives speak whatever the historians wished them to say. This example shows, if anything, not only that indirect speech does not necessarily indicate Arrian's doubts about the originality of the characters' words, but also, conversely, that direct speech does not prove that Arrian trusts his sources about the words was presented to have been uttered.

We must therefore not hasten to conclude that Arrian presents the dialogue of 3.10.1–4 as a *λεγόμενον* to inform us that he drew it from his secondary sources.⁵⁶ Had Arrian doubted the validity of this story, he would not have defended Alexander's words and behaviour. For this reason, the use of *λέγουσιν* cannot be seen as an indicator of Arrian's suspicions, nor does it necessarily allude to a secondary source.⁵⁷ Rather, it occurs at a point where Arrian's aim is to draw our attention on Alexander's virtues in a more vivid way, as is also evident in Arrian's comment at the end of the episode: 'For these reasons I commend Alexander, and equally so for his bold resolve for a daylight action' (3.10.4). This example exhibits both the function we examined in the previous section (a focus on Alexander's virtue) as well as the one examined in this section, the emphasis on a turning point of the plot, Alexander's victory over the Persians in one of the most central battles of the enterprise.

A similar case in which indirect speech merely emphasises the significance of a historical event is found in the account on the unwillingness of the army to move beyond the Hyphasis (5.28.1–4).⁵⁸ Arrian composes this episode in direct speech (5.25.2–27.9) until we reach the reaction of the troops after Coenus' speech and Alexander's anger. Here, the soldiers' uproar is offered in indirect speech without any governing phrase or verb (intrusive infinitives) (5.28.1):

⁵⁶ See Strasburger (1934) 35; Bosworth (1980) 15, 295, who allows for the possibility that it belongs to 'Callisthenes' derogatory portrait of Parmenio'; Hammond (1993) 238, who believes that the story stems from Cleitarchus' account and that Arrian doubts it; Carney (2000).

⁵⁷ Cf. Sisti's (2001) 490 view that the story may be attributed both to Aristobulus/Ptolemy and the vulgate tradition.

⁵⁸ For this passage, see Hammond (1993) 260; Bosworth (1995) 354–6; Sisti and Zambrini (2004) 513–15.

τοιαῦτα εἰπόντος τοῦ Κοίνου θόρυβον γενέσθαι ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις· πολλοῖς δὲ δὴ καὶ δάκρυα προχυθέντα ἔτι μᾶλλον δηλώσαι τό τε ἀκούσιον τῆς γνώμης ἐς τοὺς πρόσω κινδύνους καὶ τὸ καθ' ἡδονὴν σφίσι εἶναι τὴν ἀποχώρησιν.

After Coenus had spoken in this way, it is said that his speech produced uproar among the audience and that many even shed tears, still further proof that their minds did not go with further dangers and that what they wanted was to return home.

Alexander's anger due to the unwillingness of his men and his statement that he is intending to continue with those who are willing to follow him are related in direct speech, while his decision to withdraw in his tent for three days without meeting anyone is narrated in some further intrusive infinitives:

ταῦτα εἰπόντα ἀπελθεῖν ἐς τὴν σκηνὴν μηδέ τινα τῶν ἐταίρων προσέσθαι αὐτῆς τε ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ἐς τὴν τρίτην ἔτι ἀπ' ἐκείνης, ὑπομένοντα, εἰ δὴ τις τροπὴ ταῖς γνώμαις τῶν Μακεδόνων τε καὶ ξυμμάχων, οἷα δὴ ἐν ὄχλῳ στρατιωτῶν τὰ πολλὰ φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι, ἐμπεσοῦσα εὐπειθεστέρους παρέξει αὐτούς.

After these words it is said that he went back to his tent, and did not admit even any of the Companions that day nor till the third day after, waiting to see if any change of mind on the part of the Macedonians and allies, such as often occurs in a crowd of soldiers, would come over them and make them easier to persuade.

Later on (5.28.4), Arrian cites Ptolemy as his source for the information that the sacrifices Alexander made were unfavourable, but it would be far-fetched to accept Bosworth's assumption that the preceding infinitives are signs that Arrian is citing Ptolemy.⁵⁹ The use of indirect speech is difficult to explain in this case. Although it has been argued that Arrian uses the intrusive infinitives in order to express his uneasiness over the data he offers,⁶⁰ this view can hardly stand for the following reasons.

Firstly, what is related here in indirect speech is the army's reaction to Coenus' speech. If we accept that Arrian expresses his doubts about this

⁵⁹ Bosworth (1995) 354.

⁶⁰ Hammond (1993) 260; Bosworth (1995) 354. See also Brunt (1983) 531–2, who allows for the possibility that Arrian uses indirect speech in order to show that he uses a source (perhaps Aristobulus) other than Ptolemy.

subject, there are at least three alternatives about what exactly he doubted. A first thought could be that Arrian did not believe that the debate between the king and Coenus actually took place in the presence of the army. However, this cannot hold true, since Arrian has already presented Alexander as delivering his speech in front of his army and the army's reaction as being the main reason why Alexander invited those willing to speak to do so. Had Arrian not believed that things developed in such a way, he would have used indirect speech for the whole episode and not only for the troops' reaction.

A second thought could be that Arrian doubts the unwillingness of the soldiers itself, which is however even more unlikely. To believe that Arrian wished to share with his readers his hesitation about the Macedonians' unwillingness would be to overlook Arrian's compositional and interpretive goals in this scene. The whole episode should be read as part of a whole that unfolds already from Book 5. From Arrian's comment in 5.24.8 onwards, the reader has already been prepared for the Macedonians' reaction. In this respect, it would be contradictory for Arrian to aim to show to the reader his doubts concerning the negative impact of Alexander's exorbitant aspirations on the Macedonians' morale. On a narrative level, the reaction of the army is portrayed as something totally reasonable and justifiable.⁶¹

A third option would be to assume that Arrian 'may well be uneasy about the picturesque description of the reaction to Coenus' speech'.⁶² However, Arrian's description is far from 'picturesque'. The sole vivid detail is the tears of the soldiers (*δάκρυα προχυθέντα*), which however recurs in direct speech at the end of the episode (5.29.1) as well as on other occasions too (6.13.2; 7.11.5–12.3), where we read much more detailed and dramatic scenes with no use of indirect speech. Last, the intensity of the Macedonians' reactions to their king's speech must not have surprised Arrian, who was fully aware of their 'sharpness and insolence' (7.29.4).

Equally misunderstood is Arrian's citation of Ptolemy concerning the negative outcome of Alexander's sacrifice at the Hyphasis. Some have discerned Arrian's scepticism in this case.⁶³ However, Alexander's sacrifice (as well as the soldiers' unwillingness to follow him) marks a turning point in the narrative,⁶⁴ i.e., the end of the expedition to the East. This is an example of Arrian's usual method of marking pivotal events of Alexander's conquest by

⁶¹ Liotsakis (2019) 68–70.

⁶² Bosworth (1995) 354.

⁶³ Bosworth (1995) 355–6.

⁶⁴ Cf. Schwartz (1895) 1238, who includes this citation of Ptolemy in those cases where 'A. einen einzelnen Gewährsmann dann nennt, wenn er einen wichtigen Punkt ... durch Angabe der Quelle decken will'.

means of sacrifices or omens. One may compare this case with the sacrifices in Macedonia, the Hellespont, and Troy at the beginning of the expedition (1.11.1–12.2), the sacrifice before the battle of the Tanais (4.4.3), before the crossing of the Indus (5.3.6) and on the eve of Nearchus' voyage in the Indian coastline to the Persian Gulf (6.19.5).

We can better understand what Arrian intended in this passage if we examine it in the light of 7.6.1–5. Indirect speech in this passage has been equally misinterpreted, as it has been taken as a sign that Arrian is changing sources. In 7.6 Arrian explains that the Macedonians were disturbed by Alexander's decision to accept into his army 30,000 young Asian soldiers and to include in the Companion cavalry troops from the conquered peoples, as well as by his and Peucestas' embracing of the Persian way of life. Three of the reasons for the Macedonians' resentment are offered in indirect speech introduced by the verb *λέγονται* (7.6.2):

καὶ οὗτοι ἀφικόμενοι λέγονται ἀνιᾶσαι Μακεδόνας ... εἶναι γὰρ οὖν καὶ τὴν Μηδικὴν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου στολὴν ἄλγος ... καὶ τοὺς γάμους ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῷ Περσικῷ ποιηθέντας οὐ πρὸς θυμοῦ γενέσθαι τοῖς πολλοῖς αὐτῶν.

It is said that their arrival aggrieved the Macedonians ... ; that in fact they were greatly pained to see Alexander wearing the Median dress ... while the marriages celebrated in the Persian style did not correspond to the desires of most of them.

The other reasons are recorded in indicatives (*ἐλύπει, κατελέγησαν*) and the whole unit is recapitulated in the closing phrase *ταῦτα πάντα ἐλύπει τοὺς Μακεδόνας* (7.6.5: 'all this aggrieved the Macedonians').

This alternation of direct and indirect speech has often been thought to denote an alternation of sources. It has been argued that Arrian drew the material offered in indirect speech from his secondary sources, probably from authors who followed the vulgate tradition, according to which a mutiny took place at Susa. According to this view, in returning to direct speech, Arrian shows to the reader that he has returned to his two primary sources, Ptolemy and Aristobulus. On the other hand, some believe that indirect speech does not emerge from a changing and amalgamating of the sources. It rather intrudes in the middle of a coherent narrative to prepare the reader for the ensuing mutiny at Opis.⁶⁵

In this case, indirect speech by no means indicates Arrian's doubts because the same information is later on offered in direct speech (7.8). The notion that

⁶⁵ On all these views, see Sisti and Zambrini (2004).

the citations are included as a means of emphasis suggests that indirect speech rather functions in this passage as the intrusive infinitives on the Macedonians' unwillingness at the banks of the Hyphasis do. In both cases, indirect speech draws our attention to the army's opposition to the king's will and thereby marks a turning point in the plot. In the Hyphasis narrative it signals the end of the campaign in India and in this case it precludes the turmoil at the delta of the Tigris.

IV. Introductory and Transitional Citations

The opening paragraphs of the *Anabasis* (1.1–6) exemplify a context in which Arrian's use of anonymous citations has an introductory function. After the first proem, the account begins with Philip's succession by Alexander, the latter's visit to the Peloponnese and the diplomatic atmosphere in Greece. Arrian narrates all these details in indirect speech introduced by the words *λέγεται δὴ Φίλιππος ...* (1.1.1–3). Indirect speech (conveyed by infinitives) is retained in the first four paragraphs, until Alexander's march against the Triballians (1.1.4–5). Then Arrian shifts to direct speech with the words *διαβὰς δὲ τὸν Νέστον ποταμὸν λέγουσιν, ὅτι δεκαταῖος ἀφίκετο ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸν Αἴμον. καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀπήντων ...* (1.1.5–6: then he crossed the river Nestus and it is said in ten days to have reached Mount Haemus, where he was met in the defile of the approach to the mountains by many of ...').

Bosworth argues that these first four paragraphs of the work can hardly be considered to be a *λεγόμενον*, as the use of *λέγεται* at the beginning, governing the following infinitives, is merely a literary (introductory) *topos*. Bosworth recognises in this *λέγεται* a practice as old as Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (1.2.1), which was also employed by other authors as well, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*AR* 1.9.1).⁶⁶ On the other hand, others believe that the information offered in indirect speech and pertaining to the period up to the point that Alexander crossed the Nestos stems from a source other than Aristobulus and Ptolemy, who are allegedly cited for the first time in indirect speech with the use of *λέγουσιν*.⁶⁷ According to Hammond, that the events narrated in these paragraphs were taken from a secondary source is indicated by the sketchy character of 1.1.1–4.

⁶⁶ See Bosworth (1980) 20, 45 followed by Sisti (2001) 305. Cf. Schwartz (1895) 1241; Strasburger (1934) 20 considers the *λέγεται* as indicating the succinct character of these paragraphs and Arrian's indifference towards them; cf. also Kornemann (1935) 23, 31 n. 5, 98; Bosworth (1988) 39–41.

⁶⁷ Brunt (1976) 4–5 n. 2; Stadter (1980) 73; Hammond (1993) 190–1.

I would like to add some further arguments in favour of Bosworth's view. First, in these paragraphs of indirect speech Arrian can hardly have doubted the information he offers. Philip's death and his succession by Alexander, the latter's visit to the Peloponnese and the green light he received from the Greeks as a continuator of Philip's vision, as well as Sparta's opposition and Athens' untrustworthiness, all this was well-known information from Alexander's time up to Arrian's age and must have also been included at the beginning of Ptolemy's and Aristobulus' works.⁶⁸ The view that Arrian did not question this data is also strengthened by the fact that he later on in his account returns to these subjects and, what is more, in more detail than here. As for the Greeks' hostility towards the Macedonians, in the narrative on the destruction of Thebes Arrian analeptically refers to the Arcadians' initial intention to support the Theban revolt, while he also records the Elians' decision to repatriate some pro-Macedonian exiles (1.10.1) and the Aetolians' embassy which apologised to Alexander for the revolt (1.10.2). Arrian also takes it for granted that at this time Alexander was worried by the Spartans' and Aetolians' anti-Macedonian policies and Athens' unreliability (1.7.4). Arrian seems to be confident about the validity of this data and has no qualms about including it in direct speech. Therefore, it is hard to believe that he feels insecure about offering a concise summary of the first period of Alexander's reign and that the indirect speech of 1.1–6 reflects his scepticism.

Furthermore, Hammond's view that the sketchy character of 1.1–6 mirrors Arrian's doubts about what he writes and therefore should be taken as an explanation of why he used indirect speech is weak for at least three reasons. First, as just demonstrated, the summary offered in these paragraphs offers no questionable information and includes only a small amount of knowledge in comparison with the more detailed picture Arrian seems to have conveyed about Alexander's debut. Second, Hammond undervalues Arrian's literary creativity to such a degree that he denies him even the capability of summarising. Third, this thesis is incongruent with Arrian's typical use of indirect speech, which we demonstrated in the previous sections. For as transpires from our analysis so far, Arrian is usually more prone to use indirect speech as an expression of his scepticism in episodes rich in the minutiae of a state of affairs and not in summarising delineations of the general historical context such as the one offered in 1.1–4. For these reasons, the *λέγεται δὲ* of 1.1.1 and the subsequent indirect speech cannot, in my opinion, reflect Arrian's doubts about what he is recording.

Now, as for the view that this scheme should better be taken as an introductory formula, the two passages from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and

⁶⁸ Bosworth (1980) 45–51.

Dionysius' *AR*, which Bosworth mentions in his effort to argue for this idea, are of some help in that they indicate that Arrian could have drawn this scheme from both his main literary model, Xenophon,⁶⁹ and other prose writers. Most importantly, however, Bosworth's view can further be strengthened by some parallels not from other authors but from Arrian's own writings. In particular, this is also the way in which Arrian opens his narration of the main subject of the *Indike*, i.e., the Macedonian fleet's voyage from the Indus delta up to that of the Tigris and Euphrates under Nearchus' command. When Alexander reached the Indus delta, he decided to divide his forces into three parts, all of which would have to return to Mesopotamia, but each by a different route. In the *Anabasis*, Arrian focuses on the arduous march of the troops under Alexander's command through the Gedrosian desert (6.22–6). However, from the very beginning of his account about Alexander's activities in India, Arrian explains to the reader that he wishes to write a separate work on the voyage of the troops under Nearchus' command close to the coastline extending from the Indus up to the Tigris and Euphrates (5.5.1; cf. 6.28.6). Arrian kept his promise and bequeathed us the *Indike*, a work organised in two parts: (a) an introduction about India's geomorphology, nature, and ethnography (*Ind.* 1–17); and (b) the account of Nearchus' voyage, which is based on Nearchus' own *Periplous* (*Ind.* 18–43). After completing his extensive introduction about the Indian land, Arrian opens his narrative about the *periplous* with a 'Homeric' catalogue of Alexander's ships and their commanders (*Ind.* 18.1–10). Essentially only after this catalogue does Arrian begin narrating the events pertaining to Nearchus' voyage. He opens his account with the following words (*Ind.* 20.1–4):

Νεάρχω δὲ λέλεκται ὑπὲρ τούτων ὅδε ὁ λόγος. πόθον μὲν εἶναι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐκπεριπλώσαι τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ἀπὸ Ἰνδῶν ἔστε ἐπὶ τὴν Περσικὴν, ὀκνέειν δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ τε πλόου τὸ μῆκος καὶ μή τινα ἄρα χώρα ἑρήμῳ ἐγκύρσαντες ἢ ὄρμων ἀπόρῳ ἢ οὐ ξυμμέτρως ἐχούσῃ τῶν ὠραίων, οὕτω δὲ διαφθαρή αὐτῷ ὁ στόλος, καὶ οὐ φαύλη κηλὶς αὕτη τοῖς ἔργοισιν αὐτοῦ τοῖσι μεγάλοισιν ἐπιγενομένη τὴν πᾶσαν εὐτυχίην αὐτῷ ἀφανίσῃ· ἀλλὰ ἐκνικῆσαι γὰρ αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιθυμίην τοῦ καινόν τι αἰεὶ καὶ ἄτοπον ἐργάζεσθαι. ἀπόρως δὲ ἔχειν ὄντινα οὐκ ἀδύνατόν τε ἐς τὰ ἐπινοούμενα ἐπιλέξαιτο καὶ ἅμα τῶν ἐν νηὶ ἀνδρῶν, ὡς καὶ [τῶν] τοιοῦτον στόλον στελλομένων, ἀφελεῖν τὸ δεῖμα τοῦ δὴ ἡμελημένως αὐτοὺς ἐς προὔπτον κίνδυνον ἐκπέμπεσθαι. λέγει δὲ ὁ Νεάρχος ἐωυτῷ ξυνοῦσθαι τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ὄντινα προχειρίσῃται ἐξηγέεσθαι τοῦ στόλου.

⁶⁹ On Xenophon as Arrian's literary model, see Stadter (1967); Borza (1972); Stadter (1976); Ameling (1984); Leon (2021) 37–45.

Of this Nearchus has given the following account: Alexander had a longing to sail out into the sea and round from India to Persia, but was apprehensive of the length of the voyage and the risk that they would find a land uninhabited or destitute of roadsteads or inadequately provided with natural products so that his whole fleet might be actually destroyed; such a sequel to his great achievements would be a serious stain on them and would obliterate his good fortune. Yet his perpetual desire to do something new and extraordinary won the day. But he was in a quandary whom to choose capable of carrying out his plans and removing the fear of the men on board ship, despatched on an expedition of this kind, that they were being sent off without due thought into manifest danger. Nearchus says that Alexander discussed with him whom he would select as admiral of the fleet.

Both in the *Anabasis* and the *Indike* we have a citation with an introductory *δή* (*An.* 1.1.1: λέγεται δῆ; *Ind.* 20.4: λέγει δῆ Νέαρχος). Also, in both cases the indirect speech which emerges from the citation unfolds in the form of infinitives and not of a *ὅτι* clause. Third, in both cases the citation introduces the main theme of a work after a preliminary part: in the *Anabasis* the main account is preceded by the First Preface, while in the *Indike* the narrative follows the introductory information about the ethnographic and geomorphological physiognomy of the Indian territory and the catalogue of Alexander's ships.

The question is why Arrian, while naming in the *Indike* the main source (Nearchus) he is using, in the *Anabasis* chooses not to and uses instead the impersonal *λέγεται*. This difference between the two cases does not necessarily mean that, while for the opening parts of the account in the *Indike* he uses his principal source, in the *Anabasis* he draws from sources other than Aristobulus and Ptolemy. In the *Indike* Arrian has already cited a number of authors, whose works he used for his treatise on Indian ethnography and nature. At *Ind.* 20.1–4 he therefore wishes to clarify to the reader that, from now on, he bases his account—if not exclusively at least principally—on Nearchus' work. In the *Anabasis*, however, Arrian does not need to proceed with such a clarification because, as explained above, the information offered in indirect speech was commonly accepted and could have been drawn from any source, including Aristobulus and Ptolemy.

The use of *λέγουσιν* with a clause introduced by *ὅτι* and indicative is the way that Arrian chose to make the transition from the infinitives towards the

indicative smoother (infinitive → ὄτι + indicative → indicative).⁷⁰ The transition is made exactly at the point where the field of action is transferred to the Mt Haemus, the theatre of the first battle of the work (the one against the Thracians in 1.1.6–13), which Arrian would hardly have intended to narrate in indirect speech, given that he never offers a battle description in indirect speech.

We should also not exclude the possibility that the information offered in the clause introduced by ὄτι is borrowed from Ptolemy, who is cited after a few paragraphs in connection with the Macedonian casualties in the battle against the Triballians (1.2.7). The authors who included Alexander's operations in Europe in their works must have narrated them as a whole, and given that 1.2.7 indicates that Ptolemy had narrated the battle with the Triballians, the most reasonable assumption would be that he also included the preceding battle against the Thracians.⁷¹ Arrian, who considered Ptolemy trustworthy in cases requiring precision, drew from him not only the losses of the second battle (1.2.7) but also the duration of the march (1.1.5: δεκαταῖος) towards the battlefield of the first battle.

Arrian uses citations not only to introduce a work but also individual episodes. We find a structure similar to that of the openings of the *Anabasis* and the *Indike* (i.e., an introductory part and the opening of the main story with a citation) in the narrative about the occupation of Aornus (4.28.1–30.4). Arrian introduces this episode with some preliminary remarks about the unreliability of the rumours spread by the Macedonians that not even Heracles managed to occupy this rock. Immediately after this statement, Arrian opens the main narration of the city's occupation with the words τὸν μὲν δὴ κύκλον τῆς πέτρας λέγουσιν ἐς διακοσίους σταδίου μάλιστα εἶναι, ὕψος δὲ αὐτῆς, ἵνα περ χθαμαλώτατον, σταδίων ἔνδεκα, καὶ ἀνάβασιν χειροποίητον μίαν χαλεπήν ... (4.28.3: the circumference of the rock, it is said, is about two hundred stades, its height at its lowest part eleven stades, with only one way up, made by hand and rough). Once again, we find a citation accompanied by a δῆ. Although it comes after Arrian's thoughts about his reservations regarding the rumours about Heracles' presence at Aornus, the λέγουσι does not indicate Arrian's doubt about the size of the rock, given that after a couple of lines the narrative

⁷⁰ On the transition from infinitives to ὄτι clauses in Arrian's citations in the *Indike*, see Schunk (2019) 93. Cf. also 6.29.1 and 3.19.3–5, where we find the same scheme 'infinitives → ὄτι clause → direct speech' and the source, Aristobulus, remains the same. These examples are of great help in that they show that this scheme does not necessarily indicate a change of sources. On the reverse transition, i.e., from direct speech to ὄτι clauses and then to infinitives, see 4.13.1–3.

⁷¹ Bosworth (1980) 51.

unfolds in direct speech and presents Alexander's reaction to the news about the size of the spot. Besides, in the immediately preceding chapters Arrian has already presented the occupation of two further rocks (the Sogdian Rock and the Rock of Chorienes) and in both accounts he seems to be confident about the information he offers, in direct speech, about these forts' size (4.18.4–19.3 and 4.21.2), which must also be the case in the Aornus account.

Citations with the use of the verb *λέγειν* can also have a transitional function in progressing from one subject to another. In 3.27.1–3 Arrian introduces the short episode of Amyntas' trial with the phrase *λέγουσι δὲ καί*, which governs the infinitive *ὑπαχθῆναι* of the first sentence of this episode. The rest of the story is offered in direct speech. Amyntas' story lies at the end of the unit on Philotas' conspiracy (3.26.1–27.3), which is opened by the phrase *καὶ λέγει Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος* and a clause introduced by *ὅτι* (3.26.1), and which unfolds mostly in infinitives introduced by the phrase *Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ Λάγου λέγει* (3.26.2–4). Arrian makes it clear to the reader that for these events he drew mainly from his two principal sources. The phrase *λέγουσι δὲ καί* of 3.27.1 should not be taken as an indicator that Arrian used for Amyntas' case sources other than Aristobulus and Ptolemy.⁷² The phrase is just a means for Arrian to move from the one part of the story to the other.⁷³

V. Conclusion

Source citations and indirect speech undoubtedly reflect Arrian's vigorous engagement with his sources. These schemes frequently mirror his need to assess the validity of the material at his disposal and his wish to share with us this need and his uneasiness in cases in which he found it hard to unearth the truth from the accounts of his predecessors. We should hardly be surprised by the fact that source citations have such a role in a work, given that the very first issue its author wished to share with us is his concern about the reliability of his sources. However, examples of source citations and indirect speech such as those analysed in this paper indicate, I believe, that these practices also have some further functions which transcend the issues of reliability and scrutiny. Arrian occasionally uses source citations and indirect speech as literary *topoi* in order to emphasise his judgements of Alexander's character and choices, to

⁷² Jacoby excluded the part of the episode introduced by the *λέγουσι δὲ καί* from Ptolemy's F 13 and Aristobulus' F 22, obviously out of the belief that the phrase marks a changing of sources. However, this view has been rejected by modern scholarship (see Strasburger (1934) 38; Kornemann (1935) 23; Bosworth (1976) 12–14; Bosworth (1980) 21 and 363–4; Hammond (1993) 233).

⁷³ Cf. 7.19.3, 26.2.

create a culmination at a pivotal point of the plot development, to introduce or move to a new subject, or to signal that he will deviate from his usual *modus narrandi*.

Exactly at this point, it is worth returning to the preliminary remarks made in this paper about this kind of source citations in other Greek and Roman writers too. The fact that source citations and indirect speech also have an emphasising purpose in Arrian's literary models (Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon)⁷⁴ as well as in historians and biographers of his own age (Tacitus, Plutarch) cannot but enhance our assumption that Arrian developed his own way of using these schemes not only in order to touch upon issues of examination of the truth but also to satisfy his need, shared by many authors of the Imperial Period, to exhibit his acquaintance with traditional stylistic and literary norms of the genre that he wished to engage with.⁷⁵

University of the Peloponnese

VASILEIOS LIOTSAKIS

v.liotsakis@uop.gr

⁷⁴ On Arrian and Thucydides see Meyer (1877); on Arrian and Xenophon see Doulcet (1882); on Herodotus' influence on the Arrianic oeuvre, see Grundmann (1885); cf. Stadter (1980) 157ff. and, more recently, Schunk's (2019) and Leon's (2021) studies.

⁷⁵ Besides, it was this very need which also dictated Arrian's style in cases he used citations as a means to express his scepticism or to exhibit the critical acumen with which he treated his sources. On Arrian's use of Herodotean and Thucydidean vocabulary in such source citations, see Schunk's (2019) 12–21, 51–88, and Leon's (2021) 48–50 and 80–3 recent discussions with further bibliography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ameling, W. (1984) 'L. Flavius Arrianus Neos Xenophon', *EA* 4: 119–22.
- Augoustakis, A. (2004–5) 'Nequaquam historia digna?: Plinian Style in *Ep.* 6.20', *CJ* 100: 265–73.
- Badian, E. (1968) 'A King's Notebooks', *HSCPh* 72: 183–204.
- Borza, E. N. (1972) 'Some Notes on Arrian's Name', *Archaeologica Analekta ex Athinon* 5: 99–102.
- Bosworth, A. B. (1976) 'Arrian and the Alexander Vulgate', in id. et al., edd., *Alexandre le grand: Image et réalité. Sept exposés suivis de discussions. Vandoeuvres-Genève, 25–30 août 1975* (Geneva) 1–46.
- (1980) *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander. Volume I* (Oxford).
- (1988) *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation* (Oxford).
- (1993) 'Aristotle, India and the Alexander Historians', *Topoi* 3: 407–24.
- (1995) *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander. Volume II* (Oxford).
- (1996) *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph* (Oxford).
- Brown, T. S. (1949) 'Callisthenes and Alexander', *AJPh* 70: 225–48.
- Brunt, P. A. (1976) *Arrian. Anabasis of Alexander. Volume I* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (1983) *Arrian. Anabasis of Alexander. Volume II* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Carney, E. (2000) 'Artifice and Alexander History', in A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham, edd., *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (Oxford and New York) 263–85.
- Cook, B. L. (2001) 'Plutarch's Use of λέγεται: Narrative Design and Source in *Alexander*', *GRBS* 42: 329–60.
- Cooper, G. L. (1971) *Zur syntaktischen Theorie und Textkritik der attischen Autoren* (Zurich).
- (1974) 'Intrusive Oblique Infinitives in Herodotus', *TAPhA* 104: 23–76.
- Doulcet, H. (1882) *Quid Xenophonti debuerit Flavius Arrianus* (Paris).
- Fehling, D. (1971) *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots* (Berlin).
- Gray, V. J. (2011) 'Thucydides' Source Citations: "It is Said"', *CQ* 61: 75–90.
- Grundmann, H. R. (1885) 'Quid in elocutione Arriani Herodoto debeatur', *Berliner Studien* 2: 177–268.
- Hammond, N. L. G. (1993) *Sources of Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's Life and Arrian's Anabasis Alexandrou* (Cambridge).
- Hidber, T. (2007) 'Arrian', in I. J. F. de Jong and R. Nünlist, edd., *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden and Boston) 183–95.
- Högemann, P. (1985) *Alexander der Grosse und Arabien* (Munich).

- Instinsky, H. U. (1961) 'Alexander, Pindar, Euripides', *Historia* 10: 248–55.
- Jacoby, F. (1962) *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker. Zweiter Teil: Zeitgeschichte 106–261* (Leiden).
- Kornemann, E. (1935) *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I. von Aegypten: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Koulakiotis, E. (2006) *Genese und Metamorphosen des Alexandermythos. Im Spiegel der griechischen nichthistoriographischen Überlieferung bis zum 3. Jh. N. Chr.* (Konstanz).
- Laird, A. (1999) *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation in Latin Literature* (Oxford and New York).
- Leon, D. W. (2021) *Arrian the Historian: Writing the Greek Past in the Roman Empire* (Austin).
- Liotsakis, V. (2019) *Alexander the Great in Arrian's Anabasis: A Literary Portrait* (Berlin and Boston).
- Meyer, E. (1877) *De Arriano Thucydidio* (Rostock).
- Minchin, E. (2012) 'Commemoration and Pilgrimage in the Ancient World: Troy and the Stratigraphy of Cultural Memory', *G&R* 59: 76–89.
- Niese, B. (1893) *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten: Seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea*, vol. 1 (Gotha).
- Pearson, L. I. C. (1960) *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (New York).
- Pédech, P. (1984) *Historiens, compagnons d'Alexandre: Callisthène—Onésicrite—Néarque—Ptolémée—Aristobule* (Paris).
- Prandi, L. (1985) *Callistene: Uno storico tra Aristotele e i re macedoni* (Milan).
- Robinson, C. A. (1940) 'Alexander's Plans', *AJP* 61: 402–12.
- Roos, A. G. (1967–8) *Flavii Arriani. Quae extant Omnia*, vols 1–2 (Leipzig).
- Schunk, H. (2019) *Arrians Indiké: Eine Untersuchung der Darstellungstechnik* (Wiesbaden).
- Schwartz, E. (1895) 'Flavius Arrianus', *RE* II.1: 1230–47.
- Sisti, F. (1982) 'Alessandro e il medico Filippo. Analisi e fortuna di un aneddoto', *BollClass* 3: 139–51.
- (2001) *Arriano: Anabasi di Alessandro. Volume I* (Milan).
- and A. Zambrini (2004) *Arriano: Anabasi di Alessandro. Volume II* (Milan).
- Slater, W. J. (1971) 'Pindar's House', *GRBS* 12: 141–52.
- Stadter, P. A. (1967) 'Flavius Arrianus. The New Xenophon', *GRBS* 8: 155–61.
- (1976) 'Xenophon in Arrian's *Cynegeticus*', *GRBS* 17: 157–67.
- (1980) *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill).
- Strasburger, H. (1934) *Ptolemaios und Alexander* (Leipzig).
- Sulimani, I. (2008) 'Diodorus' Source-Citations: A Turn in the Attitude of Ancient Authors towards Their Predecessors?', *Athenaeum* 96: 535–67.
- Tarn, W. W. (1939) 'Alexander's Plans', *JHS* 59: 124–35.

- Tóth, I. T. (2007) 'Apologia Alexandrou (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.7–9)', *AAntHung* 47: 397–410.
- Tuplin, C. J. (1993) *The Failings of Empire: A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica* 2.3.11–7.5.27 (Stuttgart).
- Westlake, H. D. (1977) 'Λέγεται in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne* 30: 345–62.
- Wilcken, U. (1937) *Die letzten Pläne Alexanders des Großen* (Berlin).